



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE
JEWISH QUARTERLY
REVIEW

JULY, 1897

THE HEBREW TEXT OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

THE original Hebrew text of the Book of Sirach, from which Saadiah, a thousand years ago, made several quotations, and which was regarded as hopelessly lost, has, by the fortunate discovery of Mr. S. Schechter and Dr. Neubauer, again become—at least so far as the fifth Part (xxxix. 15—xlix. 11) is concerned—one of the recovered possessions of science.

Grateful as all feel for the discovery, we are equally thankful for the speedy appearance of the excellent edition of the fragments (Cowley and Neubauer, *The Original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897). My present intention is to offer a contribution to their correct estimation and appreciation. In the major portion of my remarks, suggestions are made for the correction of the errors of the Hebrew text (Part III); and the *prima facie* probability is established that this text of the Book of Sirach is corrupted by a large number and variety of mistakes which, however, did not exist in the texts used by the Greek and Syriac translators, though those texts were also corrupt, as is sufficiently apparent from the exegesis of the book.

A few glaring examples, especially in the Greek version, are collated in the first part; while in the second part some misunderstandings of the Greek translator, and a few cor-

ruptions of the Greek text are pointed out, by the aid of the Hebrew original. The gaps in the Hebrew text, arising from the condition of the extant fragments, have not been supplied in the edition. But in the English translation, the editors have supplied the defects by what must, on the whole, be pronounced happy conjectures. In the fourth part I have attempted to fill the greater portion of the lacunae regarded, even in the translation, as hopeless. In the fifth and last part, I offer various remarks on the linguistics of the Hebrew text from the lexicographical point of view. This text is of the highest value for the history of the Hebrew language, and especially for the origin of the Mishna dialect. Yet, while bearing this in mind, one must not lose sight of the fact—emphasized at the beginning of the last part—that Sirach enriched his diction by consciously borrowing, for the sake of ornament, phrases from the Biblical writings.

His vocabulary and phraseology he draws from the ancient literature mainly. His plane and range of diction differs, however, from that of the later Biblical authors, who adopt the expressions of their predecessors. Sirach is the oldest example of the style that constructs sentences out of a mosaic of Biblical phrases. The quotations from the Syriac version I transcribe in Hebrew letters. On a few occasions I quote Prof. R. Smend's remarks on the edition of the text of Sirach, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 22nd year, No. 6, cols. 161–166.

I. *False readings in the original Hebrew text which the Greek translator used.*

xxxix. 26. In Hebrew, the verse 26 c is to be completed thus: וְרַבָּא וְחַטָּא וְחַלֵּב חֲטִים [וְחַלֵּב חֲטִים]. The Syriac has instead of וְרַבָּא וְחַטָּא. The Greek καὶ σεμίδαλις πυρός, corrupted from σεμίδαλις πυροῦ, i. e. וְסִלְתָּה חֲטִים וְחַלֵּב חֲטִים is the original reading is proved not only by the agreement between the Hebrew and the Syriac versions,

but also by the fact that the next *stichos* contains the phrase דם ענב as the term for “wine,” borrowed from Deut. xxxii. 14, where also occurs the expression חלב כלוּת חטה identical with Ps. cxlvii. 14.

xxxix. 28. Heb. הרים יעתיקו (cp. Job ix. 5); Syr.; Gk. ἐστερέωσαν μάστιγας αὐτῶν. Corresponding somewhat to this phrase is תְּרִים יוֹיָקִין.

xxxix. 30d. Heb. בַּאֲצָרוֹ; Gk. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς = בַּאֲצָרוֹ. Possibly the original Hebrew reading was Job xxxviii. 22.

xl. 5. Heb. וְקַנְאָה אֵךְ; Gk. θυμὸς καὶ ζῆλος, i.e. (also Syr. רונא). But אֵךְ is the correct reading. This verse belongs to ver. 1 c “From the day of his birth till his death . . . nothing but jealousy, anxiety, terror.” Cp. Ps. xxiii. 6. The editors consider אֵךְ to be the original reading and correct the Hebrew accordingly.

xl. 29 c. Combining the readings in the text and margin the Heb. would be נְפֵשׁ מַטְעֵמִי זָבֵר (= מגעל). The Gk. read, instead of מַטְעֵמִי זָבֵר מַטְעֵמִים זָרִים, ἐν ἐδέσμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις. In ver. 29 d, the Greek translator read, instead of יִפְאַר (the marginal variant), or יִסְפֵּר, and rendered it πεπαιδευμένος. The Syr. has נְאַבָּא (= סְפִיר).

xli. 11. Heb. הַבְּלָי; Gk. πάνθος = אַבְּלָי.

xli. 12. Heb. אֲוֹצָרוֹת חִמְדָה (thus the marginal variant, not אֲוֹצָר כָּל כָּל חִמְדָה; cp. Hos. xiii. 15, אֲוֹצָר חִכְמָה χρυσίου = אֲוֹצָרוֹת חִרְזָן).

xli. 14 a. Heb. מוֹסֵר בְּשַׁת; Gk. παιδεῖαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ, i.e. מוֹסֵר בְּשָׁלוֹם.

xli. 16 c. Heb. וְלֹא כָל הַכְּלָם נִבְחַר (parallel with נִנְחַר); Gk. καὶ οὐ πάντα πᾶσιν ἐν πίστει εὑδοκιμεῖται. He read in his text לֹא כָל בְּאִמּוֹנָה נִבְחַר.

xli. 18. Heb. מַאֲדוֹן וּגְבָרָת (see Ps. cxxiii. 2); Gk. ἀπὸ κριτοῦ καὶ ἄρχοντος. He read מַרְיוֹן גְּבוֹר.

xli. 19 b. See Part II of these notes.

xlii. 8 d. Heb. צְנוּעָה; Gk. δεδοκιμασμένος; perhaps צְרוּף.

xliii. 13. Heb. תְּחוּה בָּרָק; Gk. κατέπαυσεν χιόνα. Perhaps תְּחוּה בָּרָךְ; the verb being in the Hiphil and transitive form and בָּרָךְ taken in the sense of לָגֵן, “snow.”

xliii. 19. Heb. וַיְצִיר כָּפֵר צְצִים ; Gk. καὶ παγεῦσα γίνεται σκολόπων ἄκρα. Possibly קְצִים in סְפִיר.

xliii. 21 a. Heb. בְּכֹל הַרִּים בְּתַלְבֵּשׁ יְשִׁין ; Gk. καταφάγεται ὅρη καὶ ἔρημον ἐκκαύσει=הַרִּים וְעַבְדָה שֶׁק (or בְּכֹל) יְאַכֵּל=כָּבֵה.

xliii. 21 b. Heb. וּנוּה, which the editors render “stateliness,” their reference being Ezek. vii. 11 (נָעַם). But the original reading must obviously have been יְבַהֵה=“he burns”; parallel to יְשִׁין=“he kindles, destroys by fire” in the previous passage. And from this follows naturally the Greek translation ἀποσβέσει=כָּבֵה.

xliv. 13. Heb. זְכָרָם ; Syr. דָּכְרִנָּה ; Gk. σπέρμα αὐτῶν, i.e. זְרֻם.

xliv. 19. Heb. דָוִי (the marginal variant, which is more original than the reading מָמָם in the text) ; Gk. ὅμοιος=רוּמָה.

xlv. 1 c. Heb. בִּימֵיו ; Gk. κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ=בְּשָׁמוֹ.

xlvii. 6. Heb. בְּנֹות ; Gk. ἐν μυριάσιω=ברכבות; ibid. Gk. ἐν εὐλογίαις Κυρίου, possibly בְּרָכוֹת.

xlviii. 10 d. Heb. וְלִמְסְבָרוּ (Syr. וְלִהְבִין) “to instruct”; Gk. καὶ καταστήσαι=וְלִהְבִין.

xlviii. 13. Heb. וּמְתַחַתְיוֹ נִבְרָא בָשָׂרָא. The editors read with the Greek translator נִבְרָא for נִבְרָא, and render the phrase “and from its place his flesh prophesied.” But this is neither a clear reference to 2 Kings xiii. 21, which is already alluded to in ver. 14 b (וּבְמַוְתָוֹת חֲמֹרִי מַעַשָּׂה), nor is the use of the term נִבְרָא in this sense probable. I rather think that this passage refers to Elisha’s miracle, recorded in 2 Kings iv. 34, when the prophet lay upon the dead boy and brought him back to life; the meaning would be “and under him the flesh was recreated.” For נִבְרָא in this sense see Ps. civ. 30 instead of בָשָׂר, the reading should be בָשָׂר. The Greek translator read נִבְרָא instead of נִבְרָא, and understood the verse to refer to 2 Kings xiii. 21.

xlviii. 18 d. Heb. אֵל בְּגָאוֹת וַיִּגְדֵּף (cp. Isa. xxxvii. 23 חֲרָפָת וּנְרָפָת); Gk. καὶ ἐμεγαλαύχησεν ὑπερηφανίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Instead of אֵל, the Greek seems to have read וַיִּתְנְדַל (cp. Isa. x. 15).

xlix. 9. Heb. **וְגַם הָכִיר אֶת אַיּוֹב הַמְכֻלָּל כֵּל דָּרְבֵי צְדָקָה** i. e. "Ezekiel also mentioned Job who observed all the paths of righteousness." As Ben Sirach had no opportunity, in his eulogy of the Fathers, to mention Job, the hero of one of the books of the Bible, it is quite intelligible that he should have mentioned him in connexion with Ezekiel, who is also only once referred to by our author (xlix. 8). The reference is to Ezek. xiv. 14. He uses, with a slight change, the expression in Ps. cxii. 5. The Greek translator read **אַיּוֹב** instead of **אַיִוֹב**, and thought of Ezek. xxxviii, and must have divided the words **הַמְכֻלָּל כֵּל**, and have read **בְּמִטְרָה לְכֻלָּל**. See Ezek. xxxviii. 22 **אַמְתִּיר עַלְיוֹן**. Also Syr. has **אַיּוֹב**. (See also Geiger's *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 282.)

Smend (col. 165) thinks that the original reading was **אַוְכִיר**, and asserts that he has, by the aid of photography, deciphered after the letters **נְבָ**, which he completes into **נְבִיא**. But apart from the improbability of the title "prophet" being given to Job, **אַיּוֹב נְבִיא** is grammatically inaccurate. It would have to be **אַיּוֹב הַנְּבִיא**.

II. *The Greek translator's misunderstandings cleared up by the text before us.*

Corruptions in the Greek text.

xxxix. 23. Heb. **נוִימָיו יוֹרֵשׁ** "His wrath dispossesses nations." Cp. Exod. xxxiv. 24; Ps. xliv. 3. The translator understands **נוִימָיו** in the sense of "cause to inherit" followed by a double accusative (cp. Job xiii. 26), and renders **δρυγὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθνη κληρονομήσει**.

xl. 9. Heb. **חֲלוֹדוּ**; the Greek translator did not read **חֲלוֹדוּ** but **χαλίλου**; hence **γεννηθήσεσθε**.

xli. 19 b. **אֱלֹהָה** the Greek translator read as **εἴλος**, and rendered it **θεοῦ**. The word before **הָלֹה** is missing in the Hebrew, and the Hebrew equivalent to **ἀπὸ ἀληθείας** in the Greek version is no longer apparent. Possibly **מַחְמָם**

was the word (cp. חורָה Zeph. iii. 4), for which the translator read מאמת.

xlii. 24. שְׁנִים the Greek translator read, not שְׁזַנִּים, and renders it διπλά; also the Syriac תְּרִין תְּרִין, and renders it οὐδεῖς.

xlv. 12 d. The Hebrew read, according to the correct completion of the lacuna, מְחַמֵּד עַיִנִים וְכָל יְוִי. In the Greek version the word יְפֵי is taken as the beginning of the next verse, ὥραῖα.

xlvi. 3. Heb. מֵ הוּא לְפָנָיו יַחֲזֹב ; Gk. τίς πρότερον αὐτοῦ οὗτως ἔστη ; The Greek translator took לְפָנָיו in the temporal sense, while the true meaning is as in Joshua i. 5 "Who could stand his ground before him?" This misunderstanding necessitated the addition of οὗτως.

xli. 1 d. Gk. καὶ ἔτι ίσχύουντι, ἐπιδέξασθαι τροφήν ; Heb. וְתוֹב אֵית בֵּיה חִילָא לְמִקְבָּלו חַפְנִיאָה ; Syr. וְעוֹד כֵּי חִיל לְקַבֵּל חַעֲנוֹג. Obviously, instead of τροφήν the reading should be τρυφήν. The sentence then becomes characteristic—"He is still capable of enjoying the pleasures of life."

xlii. 21 b. Gk. ἔως ἔστιν ; Heb. אַחֲר הָא. Hence the reading should be εἰς ἔστιν.

xliii. 9 b. Gk. ἐν ὑψίστοις Κύριος ; Heb. בְּמָרוּמי אֶל. Hence ἐν ὑψίστοις Κυρίον, as most MSS. read.

III. Emendation of the Hebrew text, mostly with the aid of the Greek Version.

xxxix. 17 d. Instead of אֲצֻרוֹת read אֲצֻרוֹת (see Ps. xxxiii. 7); Gk. ἀποδοχέντια ὑδάτων. The last word in 17 c is certainly to be read נְדָר, and is also derived from Ps. xxxiii. 7. עַמְעַד could easily turn into עַירְקָן. The whole stichos would therefore read בְּדִבְרֵינוּ יָמְדָר נְדָר (Gk. ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἔστη ὡς θημωνιὰ ὕδωρ) ; in 17 d, the original must also have been, instead of פְּיוֹ וּמְמוֹצָא פְּיוֹ (=καὶ ἐν ρήματι στόματος αὐτοῦ).

xxxix. 21. Instead of נְבָרָא read נְבָרָא (=ἐκτισται). Only thus does the sentence make sense: "Everything has been created for his use." Syr. עַבְידִין. See also xxxix. 30 c, where the Hebrew נְבָרָא has also the marginal variant נְבָרָיו.

xxxix. 24. Instead of לְוִימָה read לְזִידִים. Gk. ἀνόμοις; Syr. לְרַשְׁיעִי.

xxxix. 25 a must read חָלֵק מִרְאֵשׁ. For the Greek has ἔκτισται; Syr. אֲחֶבְרִיה, which, however, seems to be a free rendering of חָלֵק. The verb is used in the same sense as in Deut. iv. 19, where the Vulgate renders also חָלֵק with “creavit” (Septuagint: ἀπένειμε).

xl. 3 a. לְבָבָה; Gk. ἐν δόξῃ. We must therefore read לְכֻבָּד. Cp. 1 Sam. ii. 8.—Ibid. 3 b. Heb. (marginal variant עַד לְשׁוֹב, which is recognized by the editors); Syr. וּזְדִמָּא, i.e. עַד לְשִׁבָּה, לִתְחַבֵּי. the Greek has ἔως τεταπεινωμένου, and accordingly read עַד לְנַשְּׁפֵל, or, as Smend, col. 164, thinks, לְשָׁח. Cp. 1 Sam. ii. 8, from which verse also is derived the expression יֹשֵׁב בָּסָא לְכֻבָּד עַד לְמַנְחַת עֲרָב.

xl. 6 c. טַע gives no sense whatsoever. The connexion, and also the Gk. τεθορυβημένος, suggests מְרַחֵעַ, and eventually מְרַטְּעַי “He is terrified by the vision of his soul.” Cp. Talmud Jerushalmi Berachoth, 6 d, מְרַחֵעַ מִלְפָנֵי כְּמַרְחֵעַ מְפַנֵּי הַנְּחַשׁ. Of the root רַטְעַ, Levy gives only one example (following the Aruch article רַטְעַ, ed. Kohut, VII. 272 a), from the Yelamdenu: הִיא מְרַטְעַת מְרַטְעַת.

xl. 13 a. For the unintelligible מְחוֹל אֶל חֹל the margin has the variant חַיְל מְחַיֵּל, which the editors render “riches born of riches,” which, however, does not give clear sense. The Gk. χρήματα ἀδίκων suggests the correct reading חַיְל מְעַיל (see Ps. lxxi. 4), possibly originally meant to be חַיְל מְעַיל (cp. Prov. xiii. 11). Smend adopts this reading. חַיְל מְעַיל could easily have become חַיְל מְחַיֵּל; this combination is reminiscent of Ps. lxxxiv. 8, מְחַיֵּל אֶל חַיְל, and thus this phrase found its way into the text and became corrupted into חֹל. The Syriac also has נְכָסָא דְשָׁוְקָרָא.

xl. 20. Heb. יְין וְשִׁבְרָא מְחַדָּא לְבָא; Syr. יְין וְשִׁבְרָא לְבָא. The Syriac version, like the Targum, takes שִׁבְרָא to mean “old wine,” and disregards יְין. Consequently, it puts for וְמִתְבָּא מִנְהָה. The Greek has οἶνος καὶ μουσικά, i.e. οἶνος καὶ στύχος. This seems to have been the original

version. "Wine and song" always go together as sources of joy. Cp. xl ix. 1 c משתה היין ו, וכמו מור על בשרך ישו אין.

xl. 18 is, in any case, a corruption of the original reading, neither does the marginal variant give correct sense. In the Syriac this *stichos* is absent. The Greek has ζωὴν αὐτάρκους ἐργάτου. שָׁבֵר might correspond to ἐργάτου. The verb מתחזק suggests Koheleth v. 11; והעדר; and if we assume that the sentence originally read חַי יְשִׁין, we obtain the Hebrew and Greek. The Greek understands יְשִׁין as the labourer resting after his task is accomplished, in the same sense as in the text just quoted from Koheleth.

xl. 27 b. For כבודו read וכון כל כבודו; Gk. καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν δόξαν. The entire passage is taken from Isa. iv. 5, except that חפתה is substituted for חפה, with a reference to יראת אליהם. The term עיר, in the first *stichos*, makes the supposition probable that Sirach, in using חפתה, also thought of the glory of Paradise, with a reference to Ezek. xxviii. 14, מסכתך נ אלים היה כל אבן יקרה מסכתך. In the Midrash, בעדן נ אלים היה כל אבן יקרה מסכתך is explained as equivalent to חפה (cp. the thirty-two rules of R. Eliezer b. R. Jose Hagelili, rule 17); and Ezekiel's description is applied to the glorious tent given to the first man in Paradise.

xli. 14 a. Instead of שמעו read שמרו; Gk. συντηρήσατε. This corresponds to ver. 16 b, לא כל נתנה לשמור לך.

xli. 17. יושב, the marginal note, is better than in the text adopted by the editors. Gk. καὶ δυνάστον. ושָׁב might easily have become יושב.

xli. 19 a. For זו the word in the original text was probably נול; Gk. περὶ κλοπῆς.

xli. 21 b. מחשבות מחלוקת מנה in the Hebrew gives no sense. The Greek has ἀπὸ ἀφαιρέσεως μερίδος καὶ δόσεως. That would be מחלוקת חלק ומתן. This suits the context, and the verb מחשב co-ordinates with the remaining verbs (מחשב), מהבאים מהחריש.

xlvi. 1 f. Instead of וְאַל חֶשֶׁת פִּנֵּי חַטָּאת read וְאַל חֶשֶׁת פְּנֵים חַטָּאת “Do not regard sin,” in accordance with the Gk. καὶ μὴ λάβησθε πρόσωπον τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν.

xlvi. 9 d. . . . בְּנֵוּרִיה פָּנִים תְּנוּר וּבְכֹתְלִיה פָּנִים. The second *stichos*, the last word of which is missing, is translated by the editors “and in her virginity lest she be defiled.” They thus seem to have conjectured פְּנֵה as the last word. But the word פְּנֵה in the first *stichos* does not correspond to בְּכֹתְלִיה in the second; especially as the latter term occurs immediately after, at the beginning of ver. 10 a. The marginal variant has, instead of בְּנֵוּרִיה, בְּבֵית אֲבִיה; and, instead of בְּבֵית בָּעֵלה, בְּכֹתְלִיה בָּעֵלה. The same sense is given in the Gk. καὶ συνφέκτουσα μή ποτε μισθῇ; and in the Syr. וּמִן בָּעֵלה דְּלָא תְּסַתְּנָא. The original reading was, therefore, “**וּבְבִטְחָלָה**” “and with the married woman,” which the marginal variant paraphrases with בְּבֵית בָּעֵלה. The conclusion, according to the Greek and Syriac, must have been פָּנִים תְּשִׁגְנָא (cp. Deut. xxi. 15). תְּשִׁגְנָא changed into the marginal variant תְּנִשָּׁה (cp. Isa. xliv. 21).

xlvi. 15 c. Instead of רְצֹוּ read נְצֹוּ. Yet the margin has the reading מְעַשֵּׂיו (= נְצֹוּ), and this corresponds with the Gk. τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ and with the Syriac עֲבֹדוּ.

xlvi. 25 b. Instead of וַיְמִי read וַיְמִי, which is also tacitly assumed in the English translation.

xlvi. 4 a. כָּור נְפֹוח מְהֻם מְצֹוק gives no sense, and the translation of this passage is followed by a query. Instead of מְצֹוק the margin has מְזֹקָה. It should probably, however, read מְהֻם, instead of מְהֻם. “The furnace glows with the strong heat.” The Greek and Syriac had another text.—Instead of חַדְלָשׁ in 4 b, the original reading was certainly שַׁלְשָׁלָשׁ; Gk. τριπλασίως; Syr. חַדְלָתָא. The sense is: “the sun heats the mountain thrice as powerfully as a furnace.”

xlvi. 5. וְדָבְרֵי יְנִצָּח אֱבִירֵי gives no sense. I propose to read וְדָבְרֵי יְנִצָּח אֱבִירֵי “His (God’s) word gives power to the wings of the sun,” i.e. God’s word enables the sun to traverse its path rapidly. Mal. iii. 20 also speaks of the wings of the sun (וּמְרָפָא בְּכַנְפֵיהַ). The Greek and Syriac translate in the same sense καὶ ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ κατέσπευσεν πορείαν; וּבְמַלְיָה

קדישא סרחב הַלְכָתִיה. Their text seems to have had as its last word, not אָבָרו, but אָרָחו (cp. Ps. xix. 6). In the same sense נֶצֶח may be taken in ver. 13 b, וְתִנְצֵחַ זִקְוֹת וּמִזְמָה, where the Greek translates *καὶ ταχύνει ἀστραπάς*, describing the swift lightning. The Glossary, p. xxxiii, explains נֶצֶח as "to make brilliant." But the agreement of the two passages and the Greek version prove that the verb has the meaning "to hasten," literally "to give strength for a rapid flight." The marginal note on xlivi. 13 reads בָּמָה, which gives no sense. קִום is a corruption of זִקְים (a variant in one instance for זִקְוֹת); and וְתוֹנֵה is a corruption of וְתוֹנֵק, to be read as קִוְּנוֹן, according to Deut. xxxiii. 22, and rendered in a transitive sense "to sprinkle," "to shoot forth." The verb is used in the Talmud with this transitive meaning, of the gushing forth of blood. See the examples in Levy, I, 546 a. בָּמָה is an abbreviation of בְּמִשְׁפָט.

xliii. 20 b. וכרכב יקפיא מכהו (*sic* in margin; the text has מכהו instead of וכרכב מכהו). gives no sense. It must have probably read וכרכיע "He congeals the mass of water like the firmament." The smooth, shining surface of the ice is compared to the sky. The Midrash Genesis Rabba (c. 4, beginning) represents the origin of the sky as an icy congelation of the upper waters, נֶלֶד טֵפה האמצעית. Talmud Jerushalmi Berachoth, 2 c. Cp. also Ezek. i. 2 רְקִיעַ הַרְקִיעַ נָנוֹרָא. בעין הקrhoת הנורא.

xliii. 23 a. שִׁיק רְבָה . . מוחשבתו . . The editors complete the middle word חַשְׁבָּתוֹ and translate "burneth up." The added query is justified. In Greek the equivalent is ἐκόπασεν, this suggests עֲקָשָׂה. Cp. Amos ix. 5 וְעַקְשָׂה.

xliii. 23 c. According to the Gk. ἐφύτευσεν, the original reading was υπάγειον, instead of υπάγειον. But the latter term also gives good sense, as describing the stretching forth of islands across the length and breadth of the sea.

xliii. 27. לא נומך does not fit in with the context. Read לא נספיק "we cannot come to an end," if we wish to enumerate all the wonderful works of God. This agrees with the Gk. καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀφίκωμεθα.

xliv. 4 c. The marginal variant for בְּסֶפֶרָם is בְּסֶפֶרָם. This suggests בַּמְוֹסְרָם, like the Gk. ἐν παιδείᾳ αὐτῶν. Smend thinks that the word signifies "in their scholarship." I, however, fancy that this abstract derivative from סִפְרָה is improbable.

xliv. 4 d. בְּמִשְׁלָוֹתָם must be emended into בְּמִשְׁמָרוֹתָם. מִשְׁלָוֹת is in New Hebrew frequently used for מִשְׁלָם. See Levy, III, 144 a. The Syriac has בְּתַשְׁבָּחָתֵהן, and accordingly read בְּמִשְׁמָרוֹתָם. According to my emendation, the verse would read חֲכָמִי שִׁיחָ בְּמִסְרָם וּמוֹשָׁלִים בְּמִשְׁלָוֹתָם, and excellently describes the men versed in proverbs, whose aim is מִסְרָם, and whose medium of instruction is the מִשְׁלָה.

xliv. 8. For בְּתַחְלָתָם read בְּתַחְלָתָם; Gk. ἐπαίνους; Syr. תְּשַׁבְּחָתָה.

xliv. 10. Originally read לֹא תַשְׁכַּח וְצִדְקָתָם.

xliv. 18 a. Originally read בְּרִית עֲולֵם כֶּרֶת עַמּוֹ.

xlv. 1. Instead of זָכָרָו, the eulogistic addition after Moses' name, the Greek has οὐ τὸ μυημόσυνον ἐν εὐλογίαις. So also Syr. זָכָרָנָה לְבָרָכה, equal to בְּרָכָה. This seems to have been the original reading. For xlvi. 11, speaking of the judges of antiquity, has יְהִי זָכָר לְבָרָכה. That is the oldest example of this formula in mentioning names of deceased. See on this subject Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, p. 322.

xlv. 7 d. Instead of בְּתוּפָות רָאֵם, which gives here no sense, read בְּתַחְלָה from Isa. lxi. 3, where the LXX translates καταστολὴν δόξης. In this passage the Greek has περιστολὴν (var. στολὴν) δόξης. A trace of תַּחְלָה is to be found in the variant תְּזַעַר.

xlv. 8 b. Instead of בְּכֻבוֹד וְעוֹז read בְּכֻבוֹד וְעֹז; Gk. σκεύεσιν ισχύος; Syr. בְּמַאֲנָא דְחַוקְפָא. בְּמַאֲנָא means "garments."

xlv. 10 a. וְאַרְגָּמָן is to be connected with the second *stichos*.

xlv. 10 c. Instead of אַפְּוֹר וְאוֹר the Greek translator had in his text אַוְרִים וְתַמִּים, which here agrees better with the context.

xlv. 12 a. מִצְנְפָת פּוּ עַטְרָה between מעיל is senseless.

This garment was also named in ver. 8 c. We should therefore read **מַעַל לְמִצְנָפָת** (Gk. ἐπάνω κιδάρεως), which is the same as **עַל המִגְנָפָה מִלְמֻלָּה** Exod. xxxix. 23.

xlv. 25 c. **נְחֵלָת אֲשֶׁר לְפָנֵי כָבְדֹו** gives absolutely no sense. I propose to read **נְחֵלָת יְשִׁי לְבָנָו לְבָדו**, which presents a contrast to the following *stichos*, **נְחֵלָת אַהֲרֹן לְכָל זְרוּעוֹ**. The sovereignty descends from father to son; the priesthood to all descendants of Aaron. See Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, III, 279. This is the sense given by the Greek and Syriac. But they translate the first two words **κληρονομία βασιλέως**, **נְחֵלָת מֶלֶךְ**, which should therefore read **דָמְלָכָא**.

xlv. 26. After **לְבָנָו** add **וַיְתַן** **לְכָמָת לְבָן**. Thus the Greek. The Syriac has **לְשָׁפּוֹת עַמּוֹ בְצָדָק**.

xlvi. 1 e. **לְהַנְקֵם נְקֵם אֹיְבָן** cannot mean "to execute vengeance upon the enemy," for **נְקֵם** has no plural; and **לְהַנְקֵם נְקֵמת אֹיְבָן** or **נְקֵם אֹיְבָן** would mean "to take vengeance—on behalf of the enemy," not "against the foe." Cp. **נְקֵם אֹתְן נְקֵמת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנְקֵמָת אֹתְן נְקֵמת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** Num. xxxi. 2; Jer. li. 36. Instead of **נְקֵמָת אֹתְן** read **בְּקֵמָת אֹתְן**, and this would be equivalent to, which the Greek translator renders **ἐπεγειρομένους ἐχθρούς**. The Syriac translates freely **מִן נְבָרָא סְנָאָא**.

xlvi. 7 c. Instead of **בְּפַרְעֹן** read **בְּפַרְעֹן עַמּוֹ**. So also the Syr. **וַיַּעֲמֹד בְּפַרְעֹן עַמּוֹ דָמָעָה**. Cp. xlvi. 23 d.

xlvii. 7 b. Instead of **וַיְתַן בְּפָלָשִׁתִים עָרִים** read **וַיְתַן בְּנָתִים בְּאָרוֹם**. Cp. Ezek. xxv. 14. The Syriac also translates thus: **וְאַתְפָּעֵן מִן פָלָשִׁתִיאָה**. The Greek translator renders **καὶ ἔξουδένωσεν Φυλιστιεὺμ τοὺς ὑπεναυτίους**. He must have had **וְחוּרָם פָלָשִׁתִים הַקְמִים**.

xlvii. 11 d. Instead of **יְרוּשָׁלָם** read, with the Greek and Syriac, **יִשְׂרָאֵל**.

xlvii. 18 c. Instead of **כְּבָרְאֵל** read, with the Greek and Syriac, **כְּבָרְיָה**.

xlviii. 4 b. After **אֲשֶׁר**, add **מַי**.

xlviii. 8. Instead of **מֶלֶא** read **מֶלֶךְ**. This refers to Jehu, the king who executed vengeance (Gk. ἀνταπόδομα) on the house of Ahab. Jehu was not indeed anointed by Elijah, but Elijah gave him the impulse to his work (1 Kings xix).

16). The Greek and Syriac Versions, which read מלבי, think of Hazael as well as of Jehu (1 Kings xix. 15).

IV. Gaps in the Hebrew text supplied from the Greek or Syriac Versions.

xxxix. 17 d. See supra, under III.

xxxix. 28 b.]. ובחרמתם הר[ים עתקיו.

xl. 26 d. מטמ[וְ] does not suit the context. The equivalent to the corresponding Greek term (*βούθειαν*) and Syriac (מעירנה) is ערה. Possibly we should supply משען[].

xli. 5 b. In the first *stichos*, ונדר אויל[תולדה רשות]. תולדה רעים (variant רבת רעים) is a corruption of the Syriac has in both halves of the verse.

xlvi. 20 b, 21 c. מהביט[אל אשה זורה] ומה[ש[ק[י[פ[] אל בעולה.

xlvi. 23 a.]. הוא ח[י[וקיט[ל[עד[. Syr.

xlvi. 14 b.]. ויעפ[ען ברש[]. See ver. 17 c.

xlvi. 15.]. בגדלו הגביר עננים[ל[חפץ אبني ברד[].

xlvi. 3 a. ברכבו[אאותה הס[יר]. See Exod. viii. 5, 27; x. 17.

xlvi. 13 b.]. ולא ל[בשם לעולם[ז[ר[.

xlvi. 20 d.]. כי איש[י[חלקו[].

xlvi. 23 b.]. בגבורה ח[שלישי[].

xlvi. 6 a.]. ויפוי[ל[ס[על העם[] וב[מזרע האבירים[].

xlvi. 10.]. שט[ל[חנימ[הור[] בכל שנה ו[נ[ה[].

xlvi. 11.].]. נם[י[העביר פשעו[].

xlvi. 22 c.]. ויתן ל[יעקב פלייה[] ול[דוד ממן שרש[].

xlviii. 3 b.]. וירוד שליש[אשות[].

xlviii. 11.]. אשר ראך ומת [הוא ?]. לא ב[]. היה ייחיה that saw thee, die ? Nay, he shall surely live." After the Syriac.

xlviii. 12.]. אליו[בensus נלקח[]. ואליישע[]. נמלא רוחו[].

xlviii. 22 d.]. אשר צוה ישעה הנביא הגדול והנאמן בחוונו[].

xlviii. 23.]. בימי עמד השמש וווסף על חי המלך[].

V. Sirach's Vocabulary.

In regard to the lexicographical peculiarities of Sirach, we must first note the circumstance that he borrows a

quantity of ready-made expressions and phrases from the Scriptures. One can say that Sirach already exhibits that mosaic style which is characteristic of the productions of the later post-Talmudical Hebrew literature. The chapters before us can furnish us with a large number of examples of this style. In the following list I omit those passages where Sirach quotes Biblical phrases, because the subjects are taken from the Bible: as e.g. the description of the high-priest's garments, &c. An example of mosaic work is the Biblical phrase used in a sense different to that it has in the original passage from which it is taken: e.g. the expression אֶם כָּל חַי is used of the earth, the mother of all living, while in Gen. iii. 20 it designates Eve. The most noteworthy of Biblical phrases in these chapters, used by Sirach for the adornment of style, are the following:—

- xlv. 11 אֲבֹנֵי חַפֵּז (Isa. liv. 12).
- xli. 2 אֵין אֱנוּמִים וְחַסְרָ עַצְמָה (Isa. xl. 26).
- xlvi. 9 לְהַדְרֵינוּ עַל בָּמָתִי אָרֶץ (Deut. xxiii. 29; Amos iv. 13).
- xlvii. 3 בְּנֵי בְּשֵׂן (Deut. xxxii. 14).
- xlvi. 5 [בְּרֵד וּנוֹחַ] לְאַש (Ps. xviii. 23).
- xxxix. 26 דָם עַנְבָּה (Deut. xxxii. 14).
- xxxix. 27 הַרְיִם יְעַתִּיקו (Job ix. 5).
- xl. 15 וְהַחֲיוֹתִי וְאַסְפָּרָה (Job xv. 17).
- xxxix. 26 c חַלֵּב חַטָּה (see above, Part I).
- xlvii. 20 וְתַחַלֵּל אָתְּ יְזֻעָּךְ (Gen. xlvi. 4).
- xl. 13 חַזְוֵי קְלֹות (Job xxxviii. 25).
- xxxix. 30 חַרְבָּ נָקְמָת (Lev. xxvi. 25).
- xl. 9 וְחַרְחֵר וְחַרְבָּ (Deut. xxviii. 22).
- xliv. 21 מִים עַד יִם וּמְנֹהָר עַד אַפְסִי אָרֶץ (Ps. lxxii. 8).
- xxxix. 23 וַיַּהַפֵּךְ לְמַלְחָה מִשְׁקָה (an allusion to the destruction of Sodom; משקה in Gen. xiii. 10).
- xlvi. 19 נָחוּ עַל מִישְׁכָּבוֹ (Isa. lvii. 2; cp. Kethuboth, 104 a).
- xlvii. 22 נַיְן וּנְכָר (Isa. xiv. 22).
- xlv. 12 עַטְרוֹת פּוֹ (Ps. xxi. 4).
- xl. 27 כָּל בְּבוֹד חַפְתָּה (see above, Part III).
- xl. 3 עַפְרָ וְאַפְרָ (Gen. xviii. 27).
- xlv. 19 שְׁבִיב אַשְׁוֹ (Job xviii. 5).

לְחֵם מִתָּה לְחֵם xlviii. 2 (Lev. xxvi. 26).

שֶׁד וַשְׁבָר xl. 9 (Isa. lx. 18).

שְׁחָק מָאוֹנִים xlvi. 4 (Isa. xl. 15).

שְׁלָע xl. 15 (Job xxxix. 28).

That Sirach used such words, which occur very seldom, is evident from the Glossary which Driver has carefully compiled. To these words belongs also עַן, plural, and זְנוּם, in the sentence on Ezekiel xlix. 8, יְחוּזָקָל רָאָה זְנוּם מְרֻכְבָּה. Yet it is not quite clear what is meant by "divers kinds of chariots"; as there was only one divine chariot in Ezekiel's vision, and its parts cannot be described as "kinds." The Syriac, indeed, also read גְּנוּסָא דְמְרֻכְבָּתָא (גְּנוּסָא), but in the Greek version the word is unregarded. I believe that the original text had זְיוּן "the glory of the chariot" (cp. the Talmudical phrase: זְיוּן הַשְׁבִּינָה), which turned into זְיוּן.—שְׁלָע, which word in xlvi. 3 should have the same meaning as in Prov. viii. 21, is ambiguous. I think it probable that the *stichos* read שְׁרָה וְעַל מְחֻלְקֹות נְחָלָה וְיַרְשָׁה could have become שְׁרָה וְיַרְשָׁה. The marginal variant has, instead of שְׁרָה, שְׁרָה, into which שְׁרָה could easily have turned. The Greek has κληρονομίας ἔταίρων, and thus read נְחָלָת רְעִים.

In the vocabulary of this text of Sirach, those words are especially noteworthy which are neither to be found in the Bible nor in the traditional literature, or which are used in a unique sense.

Substantives to be noticed are—^{וְהִירָה} "brightness" (xlivi. 8); ^{תְּלִיפּוֹת}, in the sense of "past" (xlvi. 19); ^{לְקַח}, with the meaning of ^{מְקַח} (xlvi. 7, where מְתָח וְלְקַח is used in the sense of שְׁאָה וְתַחַת); ^{מְטֻמָּנָה וּמְפַתֵּן}, the margin has ^{מְטֻמָּנָה} with the same meaning as ^{מְטֻמָּן} "treasure" (xlvi. 9); ^{מְכוֹנָה} in the sense of ^{מְבָנָן} (xlvi. 6); ^{גְּפִין}, in the sense of ^{גְּפִין} (xlvi. 20); ^{פְּשָׁלָמוֹת} as a synonym of ^{פְּשָׁלָום} (xlviii. 8).

The substantives of the form מְפַעֵל (e.g. xl. 29) are indicated by the Glossary, p. xxxii. The most prominent new word is ^{תְּחִילִיף}= "successor" (xliv. 17; xlvi. 12; xlviii. 8), a word like חַלְמִיד, formed after the model of abstract nouns

but designating a person (see Kaufmann, *Monatsschrift*, XLI. 837).

Of verbal forms in Hiphil are to be noted—"הָשְׁרִיק" "to shine with a red glow" (marginal variant on xlivi. 9); **הָצַהֵיר**, denominative of **צָהִיר** "noon" (xlivi. 3). **בְּחַצְהִירָיו יְרֹתֶיחָ תָּבֵל** is not well translated "by his shining, heateth the world"; the sentence means: "When the sun shines at noon it makes the world glow." The Greek renders it ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ αὐτοῦ. The Syriac has the same relation to **הָצַהֵיר**. **בְּמִצְעַת** דְּתָהָרָה has the same relation to **הָצַהֵיר** as **צָהִיר** to **עָרֵב**, and **שְׁחִיר** to **הָעָרֵב**. The Hiphil form **חַעֲיִם**, assumed by the editors in the Glossary, is contestable; for **יעַם**, in xlivi. 16, is a corruption of **וְעַם** (Gk. *σαλευθήσεται*).

Hithpael forms—**תְּחַטְּפָה** "to allow oneself to be beguiled" (xlivi. 10, margin), also in the language of the Mishna; **הַסְתּוֹלֵל** "to maintain oneself" (xlivi. 3); **הַסְתּוֹלֵל**, "to become a burden, wearisome" (xxxix. 24 "His (i.e. God's) ways are straight to the pious but wearisome to the wicked"). Especially notable is **סָוד** אֶל **חַסְכָּנִיר** from (xlivi. 12), translated in the Gk. *μὴ συνέδρευε*; in the Syriac version **אֶל תְּשִׁפְרָר שְׂעִירָתָא**. It signifies the same as **סָוד**, Ps. Iv. 15; or, Gen. xliv. 6.

The following Aramaisms may be mentioned:—**נוֹר** "adultery" (xlivi. 9); **גַּפְהָ** "bank" (xl. 16); **עַלְעִיל** "storm" (xlivi. 18, margin); **שַׁאֲתָף** "partner" (xli. 18; xlivi. 3, margin); **טַמְמָתָן**, plur. **טַמְמָתִים** "wonder" (xlivi. 25; xlvi. 14). An Aramaism is the phrase **לְהַשְׁחֹועַת בְּתַהֲלָתָם** (xlvi. 8, see above, Part III), rendered in the Syr. **לְמַשְׁחָעֵי עַל תְּשִׁבְחָתָהָוּן**. The same verb seems also to have been retained in xliv. 15 **בְּחַכְמָתָם תְּשֻׁתָּה עַדָּה**, which must be emended into **תְּשֻׁתָּה עַדָּה**. The Greek rendering is *σοφίαν αὐτῶν διηγήσονται λαοῖ* (also in xliv. 8 *ἐκδιηγήσασθαι*). Surprising is the absolutely Aram. **מוֹסֵר** "to beat" (xlivi. 5), for which the variant is **מוֹמְחֵז** "chastisement"; **מוֹמְחֵז** was probably originally a gloss.

A few more lexicographical remarks. Sirach is partial to the use of the term **כְּתָב** (xxxix. 32; xlivi. 7; xliv. 5; xlvi. 11). The expression **חוֹרָה שְׁבָכָתָב** to denote the written

law, possibly already existed in Sirach's time.—**תְּחִלָּה** (xli. 2, 3) has the special meaning of "fixed limit," "definite period," as in Job xxiii. 14; **תְּקִדְמַת**, ibid. xiv. 5 (**תְּקִדְמָה**, *Kethib*); **לְחֵק** (in xl. 6 a), left untranslated, can also be explained in this way.—**נוֹשֶׁבֶת** (xlivi. 4) is equivalent to **רַבָּה**, as **אָרֶץ נוֹשֶׁבֶת** (xlv. 23, 25) is the same as **תְּחוּם רַבָּה**. **כָּרְשָׁׁׁף** (xlivi. 17 c) is rendered in the Greek version ὡς πετευνά; also (xlivi. 14) where the lacuna is to be supplied with the term **כָּרְשָׁׁׁף**. Hence it, at all events, follows that the translator understood this word in the same sense as the old versions of Job v. 7. It is probable, however, that Sirach himself also uses **רַישָׁׁׁף** with the meaning of "bird," as he designates with the term "the flying clouds." The translation, "darting flashes," which is offered by the editors for xlivi. 17 c, is untenable.—Instead of **קְרִידָתָה** (xl. 16), the note and Glossary, p. xxxiv, have the excellent conjectural emendation **קְרוּמִית** (see Levy, IV, 381 a). It is, nevertheless, possible that the **נ** is original, and **קְרוּמִית** is an older form of the term. I infer this from the fact that **קְרוּדִים** in the Babylonian text of the Mishna Sabbath, XXII. 6, signified "reed" (in the Palestinian text **פִּילּוּמָא** = *πήλωμα* is substituted); **קְרוּמִית** can thus designate the marsh and the reed growing on it. It is even possible that Sirach, in this passage, meant by **קְרוּמִית** the marsh or puddle itself. For the sentence reads **בְּקָעָה עַל גַּתְּה נַחַל לְפָנֵי כָּל נַדְעָכִי**. **מַטָּר** **נַדְעָכִי**, applied to a plant, gives no sense; for a plant cannot be "extinguished." On the other hand, the Book of Job, from which Sirach has borrowed several other unusual terms, applies **נַדְעָכִי** to the brook that dries up in the heat of the sun (Job vi. 17). The meaning of the sentence under discussion would accordingly be, "As a puddle by a brook which dries up before the rain," i.e. before the rain, which supplies it with moisture, comes. The Greek and Syriac deviate widely from this text. The Syriac has the following for the second *stichos*, **דְּקוּם כָּל יְוִין** (=Job viii. 12 b). The Greek also read for **חַצֵּיר** **חַצֵּיר הַיָּא יְבָשָׂא**—An apparent Arabism may be noted. In two passages of our text, the verb **חַלֵּק** is found in a context which would

give it approximately the sense of “to create” (=Arab. **خَلَقَ**, **خَلْقٌ**); and in both passages, the Greek as well as the Syriac version so render it: xxxix. 25 a (see above, under III) **טוֹב** **עַסְק** **נְדוּל** **חָלֵק** **אֶל** **וּשְׁוֹל** **בְּכָד** **עַל** **בְּנֵי** **אָדָם** 1; and xl. **לִטְבוּבִים** **חָלֵק** **מִרְאֵשׁ**. Smend assumes that **חָלֵק** has the meaning “to create.” Yet this view seems inadmissible; for nowhere else in the Hebrew language do we find the word with this meaning. The signification “to divide,” “allot,” “destine,” gives good sense in both passages, which speak of the lot assigned to every human being by God. The verb has the same meaning as in xlii. 2, **רָב** **כְּבָד** **חָלֵק** [לְהָמָן] **עַלְיוֹן**, where the Greek also renders ἐκτισεν (Syr. **نَفَلُونَ**). For the Biblical usage ep. especially the use of the substantive **חָלֵק** in Job xx. 29; xxvii. 13; xxxi. 2.

A point in syntax may be noted. Beside such idioms as חיל משלו י (xli. 10)—cp. xl. 13 a, above, Part III—for which reference should be made to the Glossary, we find short forms after the model of יום אירא (Ps. lvi. 4); ממקומ תגורו י (Isa. li. 1). See xli. 10 ; xl. 13 a. They harmonize with the rhythmical forms of the sayings of Sirach, which follow the model of the scriptural parallelisms which involve elliptical constructions.

W. BACHER.

March, 1897.

POSTSCRIPT

Since the foregoing article left my hands in the middle of last March, several critical notices of the recently published fragment of Sirach have appeared. Naturally, these have dealt with some of the points discussed in my article. It is unnecessary to indicate these points in detail, but I should like to add a few remarks on some of the points which have been raised.

M. Israel Levi has devoted pp. 1-50 of the *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. xxxiv, to an elucidation of eighty-two numbered passages from Sirach, and has treated, in an admirable style, of the relations between the Hebrew text and the Greek and Syriac Versions. In no. 9 he remarks that the Syriac in xl. 20 read *וְיָמֵינוּ* instead of

וַיְיִשְׁכָּר. The Syriac, however, must have read שֶׁבֶר, for the translation חֲמֹרָא עֲתִיקָא is the Targum for שֶׁבֶר in Num. vi. 3 and Judges xiii. 4. (Cf. Peschitto to Num. xxviii. 7.) — In no. 14 M. Levi completes xli. 19 b to מִאמְרֵין אֱלֹה וּבְרִית, which, however, gives no sense in the context. According to my suggestion above (II) the reading is מִחְמָס אֱלֹה וּבְרִית, i. e. “(Guard thyself) against the violation—infringement—of oath and covenant.” This also explains the Syriac translation מִתְלָדְבָּטֵל (= מִתְהַמֵּם). — In no. 20 M. Levi thinks that in xlivi. 30 the Greek read וּבְרָכָה instead of וּבְרָכָת, and translated it by κρύσταλλος. But ברקָת is the name of a precious stone, which the Greek would not have rendered κρύσταλλος. I think that my suggestion above (III) is more probable. — In no. 21 M. Levi holds that in xlivi. 21 b the Greek read יְבוּה for וְנוּהָ. As, however, the Greek has ἀποσβέσει, we must go further in the emendation and suppose that the Greek read יְכֻבָּה. It is very surprising that Levi translates ἀποσβέσει by “brûle.” — In no. 29 M. Levi holds that the Greek must have read בְּקָמִים אוֹיְבִים, which he rightly regards as ungrammatical. But the Greek probably read בְּקָמִי אוֹיְבִים or בְּקָמִים אוֹיְבִים (see above, III), which is in accordance with the biblical use of the Status Constructus. Two co-ordinate nouns are combined by the use of the construct state. (Thus בְּתִ צִיּוֹן הַבְּחוּלָה = בְּתוּלָה בְּתִ צִיּוֹן.) — In no. 34 M. Levi thinks that the Greek read יְגַנְּפָה for וַיְגַדֵּל. I have discussed the point above (I). — In no. 78 M. Levi holds that אָמַן־כָּל־חַי in xl. 1 c, to which I have above called attention as an example of the mosaic style of Sirach, is not an original reading, though the Greek has μηγέρα πάντων. I think this opinion untenable, and that the original reading was indeed אָרֶץ כָּל־חַי, and not אָמַן כָּל־חַי. Sirach had Job i. 21 in his mind, where the mother's body and the earth in which man is received after death are connected in idea. It is thus no foreign figure to picture the earth as the “mother of all things.” The whole verse in Sirach, מִיּוֹם צָאתָו מִבְּכָן אָמַן וּרוּם אֲשֶׁר שָׂמַה, is closely parallel to the passage which I have cited from Job. — In no. 82 M. Levi explains xlvi. 25 c d as I have done above (III), but he cannot make sense of the words נְחַלָּת אֲשֶׁר. My view, that the original reading was נְחַלָּת יְשִׁי, I will not support by a reference to Isaiah xi. 1, גַּעַשׁ יְשִׁי. Perhaps one might call to mind the passage in 2 Sam. xx. 1, 1 Kings xii. 16 וְלֹא נְחַלָּת לְנוּ בֵּן יְשִׁי.

Prof. S. Fränkel (*Monatsschrift*, XLI, pp. 380–384) has also called attention to the substantival adjectives in Sirach, e.g. נְשַׁבֵּת (= נָשָׁבֵת “=” נָשָׁבֵת) and אֲרֵן נָשָׁבֵת (= אֲרֵן נָשָׁבֵת). Of נְרָבָה (= רַבָּה), xlivi. 3, his explanation agrees with

mine. Well worthy of note is Fränkel's suggestion that the Greek translator, in rendering נִשְׁתָּחַת, xlivi. 5, by κατέσπενσεν, thought of נֵחֶם (see above, III). Moreover, Fränkel believes that in the Greek of xlivi. 19 the translator had before him בְּסִיר instead of בְּסִוףִיר. According to Levi, no. 19, the original word was בְּסִופִי, but this is philologically untenable.

In the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XI, 95–103, Dr. Felix Perles has made some interesting remarks on the Hebrew text of Sirach. He thinks that נִשְׁבַּת, xlivi. 4, is an imitation of the Greek οἰκουμένη, but the expression is purely Hebraic. It is an abbreviation of the phrase אָרֶץ נִשְׁבַּת in Exod. xvi. 35, which is the opposite of אָרֶץ לֹא נִשְׁבַּת in Jer. vi. 8.—With regard to a verse from an earlier portion of Sirach than is in the fragment (III, 21) frequently quoted in the Talmud and Midrash, Perles remarks that the original Hebrew was not עַסְק but חֻזָּלָה בְּנִשְׁתָּרוֹת, because the Greek translation is χρεία τῶν κρυπτῶν. But, as a matter of fact, in xlvi. 23 b of our fragment, צָרָר corresponds with the Greek χρεία, and it is probable that the translator read צָרָר instead of עַסְק, the two words being closely alike in shape. The original is certainly עַסְק, for this alone gives a good sense. Cf. בְּתוֹרָה עַסְק. Prof. J. H. Müller in his remarks on Perles' article, *ibid.*, p. 103–105, also considers עַסְק the original reading.

In an article on the word תְּחִילָה in the *Monatsschrift* (XLI. 337–340), Prof. Kaufmann also discusses xlviii. 8 of Sirach. He, too, considers that מלך is the right reading instead of מליא, but his explanation of תְּשִׁלְמָוֹת is not tenable, for even though Elisha could be anointed by Elijah as his successor in his own stead, it cannot be said that Jehu, who was to be anointed king by Elisha, can be regarded as a substitute for the dynasty of Ahab which Jehu was to destroy. מלך תְּשִׁלְמָוֹת really means “king of retribution,” i.e. the king who is called to take retribution on the house of Ahab. In the choice of this word Sirach was probably influenced by 2 Kings ix. 26, where Jehu, when he is beginning the slaughter of the house of Ahab, quotes a prophetic oracle which he heard on the occasion of the judicial murder of Naboth. In this oracle the words occur: וְשִׁלְמָתִי לְךָ בְּחִילָה זוֹאת. The word שִׁלְמָה has the same meaning as שְׁלִילִים Hos. ix. 7, Ps. xci. 8, Isa. xxxiv. 8.

מלך הַמִּשְׁפָּט is a combination such as מלך תְּשִׁלְמָוֹת, the “king who exercises justice.”

W. BACHER.

BUDAPEST, June, 1897.

THE WORD תְּחִלֵּן IN ECCLUS. XLIV. 17.

WE should like to be allowed to point out that Prof. Kaufmann's polemic, in the May number of the *Monatsschrift*, against the rendering of this word by "successor," rests on a misunderstanding. "Successor" in English means more than merely a "follower": it means one who *takes the place of another, fills the same dignity, holds the same position, and carries on the same office*. Thus we meant by "successor" exactly what Prof. Kaufmann understands by תְּחִלֵּן, and if we had been writing a commentary we should have explained the term in exactly the same way. The note in the Glossary (p. xxxv) clearly showed what we understood by the word. The corresponding Hebrew verb (הַחֲלִין) is there explained, not by *follow*, but by *cause to come in place of* (cf. Kaufmann, p. 339, "an die Stelle des Vorgängers treten"), *make to succeed*, and the corresponding Syriac word by *substitute, representative* (cf. Kaufmann, "Ersatz," "Stellvertreter"). Neither of these words could, however, have been used as a *translation* of תְּחִלֵּן in any of the three passages in which it occurs. Before Prof. Kaufmann decides that "das neue Wort mit einem Uebersetzungsfehler zur Welt gekommen sei," let him find a word which will represent it—not of course in German, but in *English*—better than "successor," or (in xlvi. 12) "succeed."

The difficulty in "filled with retribution" (xlviii. 8) we do not perceive. If Micah can say he is filled with judgment (iii. 8), why cannot Jehu, in view of 2 Kings ix, x, be said to be filled with retribution? We greatly doubt the sense in which Prof. Kaufmann would understand מלך תשלומות: in New Hebrew, תשלום means "Ersatz," not in the sense of *substitution*, but in the sense of *requital, repayment, compensation* (as in such phrases as נזק, Schadenersatz, נפטר מ... החרשלומי); in the Targums, also, תשלומא is "Vergeltung" (in a good sense) in 2 Sam. xix. 37, and תושלםא is "Vergeltung" (in a bad sense) in Is. xxxiv. 8 and elsewhere. A "king of substitutions," in the sense of a king succeeding another king, seems to us a most forced and questionable rendering of מלך; and if we adopted the marginal reading מלך, we could only understand it in the sense of a "king of requitals or retrIBUTions" (the plural being naturally intensive).

PROF. SMEND'S EMENDATIONS.

IN the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (May 15, 1897) Professor Smend gives the result of a very careful examination of the Oxford Sirach-fragment, which he made in the spring of this year. Every one interested in the establishment of the new text will be glad to have

the benefit of Prof. Smend's skill and experience, although they may not always be able to accept his conclusions. Disregarding emendations (with which we are not at present concerned), the passages in which the changes are proposed are naturally in parts of the MS. which are defaced and extremely difficult to read. In such cases, often the only hope is in a happy conjecture. When once the right reading is divined, it is frequently possible to see on the MS. that it *is* right, but the final appeal must always be to the MS. itself. Prof. Smend, however, lays very great stress on the readings of the photographs, as having been taken before the MS. was *washed* (*gewaschen*). While it is true that photography often affords considerable aid in the decipherment of effaced MSS., yet it may be accepted as an axiom that its evidence is unsound unless supported by the original. In other words, there must be in the MS. some traces of the reading which is preserved more clearly in the photograph. The present MS. is no exception to the rule. After being photographed it was not *washed*—a process which is never applied to MSS. of this kind—it was *cleaned*, as far as possible, by removing dust, &c., with a soft brush or duster, and then the whole surface was covered with transparent paper. Therefore whatever has disappeared from the MS. since it was photographed can have been lost only by the accidental breaking off of minute fragments where the paper was brittle. Although the thin paste necessary to affix the transparent paper may possibly have caused the ink to run in some places, and thus rendered the reading difficult, it is impossible that, where the surface remains intact, letters should have totally disappeared. In the interest, therefore, of those who have not the opportunity of consulting the MS. for themselves, we have made a thorough examination of all the passages challenged (comparing the photographs), and now give a list of (a) corrections to which we agree without reserve, (b) passages in which we are unable to accept Prof. Smend's reading, (c) passages in which certainty is impossible, and where, therefore, we cannot either accept or reject without hesitation.

(a) The following corrections we accept without reserve: xl. 26 a, נָא יְגַב for . . . (but see under b). xl. 26, margin, קָל written as two words. xli. 21 a, margin, מֵהַשְׁעָר is written as two words. xli. 21 b, .. מִזְחָשׁ for . . . מִזְחָשׁ. xli. 21 c, . וּמְהִי. xl. 3 a, before a ב is crossed through. xl. 9 c, after a ת crossed through. xl. 10 c, תֹזֶנֶה was our conjecture; see the translation. xl. 23 a, margin, וְקִים for יְקִים. Prof. Smend's completion of this line (הָוָא חָ[י] וְעוֹמָ[ד] לְ[עָד]) is certainly favoured by such traces of letters as remain. xl. 14 d, omit the ה: it is probably only taken off from the next page. xliv. 15 a, margin, חַשְׁנָה for עֲשָׂעָה. xlv. 9, margin,

אָיְרָה for אָיְרָה (so also Prof. Bevan in the *Athenaeum* for April 3, 1897). xlv. 23 b, נַחַל after בְּנַבּוֹרָה. xlvi. 13 e, for בְּ[כִּי]אֵן. xlvii. 10 b, שְׁנָה, as we translate. xlvii. 12 a, בְּעֶבֶרְוֹ אֵין for בְּעֶם אֵין [וְ], but we should now reject the [וְ] at the beginning. xlvii. 15 a, אָרֶץ בְּסִיתְתָּה . . . ְלָ . . . אָרֶץ חֲטָאת וְחַטְאִיתָא (or perhaps יְחַטְאִיתָא) (see also under c). xlviii. 12 d, וְגַלְמָךְ בְּכָלְ וְמוֹתָהִים בְּכָלְ.

(b) The following readings we cannot see our way to accepting : xl. 19 c, עַמְּ וְיַעֲמֵד [יְ] שְׁנָר for שְׁנָר. xl. 22, מְעֻמֵּד [יְ] : but מְעֻמֵּד [יְ] would be possible. xl. 26 a, מְיַילָּה [וְ] לְלָבָב, but we agree to לְלָבָב [וְ], or better מְיַילָּה (see also under a). xl. 26 margin, we find no trace of מְיַילָּה before נַפְתָּח, although we have supplied it. xl. 26 d, מְעַמְּדָה [וְ] for מְעַמְּדָה [וְ]: the ' is not possible : even the ' is doubtful : the word looks like מְשָׁמָעָה. xli. 1 b margin, מְבוֹנָתָה for מְעוֹנָתָה. xli. 2 b, אַנְנָיִם (proposed since the article was in print) for אַנוֹיִם. xli. 19 d margin, מְמוּעָת (also proposed later) for מְמַנְעָה ; but we agree that the נְ is doubtful. xl. 9 b, after הַ nothing is certain : the remnants of יְשָׁ (whence Prof. Smend's תְּפִירָעָה), which are visible on the photograph, are really parts of the first two letters of בְּשָׁאָוָל (xli. 4 d) showing through the hole in the paper. xl. 10 b the completion לְאַתְּ[הַ]בְּ[לְ]עַד[הַ]בְּבִית [בְּ]עַד[הַ]בְּ[לְ]עַד[הַ]בְּבִית would no doubt fit the space, but the clause depends on פְּ, and לְאַתְּ פְּ therefore gives an entirely wrong sense : moreover מְ is quite uncertain¹. xl. 10 d margin, line 3, after not מְ but שְׁ in the common shortened form שְׁ. xl. 24 b, אַיְרָה [שְׁ] : we agree that שְׁ is more probable than שְׁשָׁ : then there are traces which seem to be parts of a מְ or בְּ, then possibly one more letter, after which the paper is perfectly clean and fresh : we see no signs of אַיְרָה : שְׁיַשְׁאֵיר also yields a bad sense, and would be the only instance in the fragment of the use of the relative שְׁ. xl. 1 b, the רְ in רְבָבִים [מְ] appears certain : לְהָ (i. e. ?) is not possible. xl. 7 b, חַוְפֵץ עַזְּהָ : the word after חַוְפֵץ seems to be שְׁנָה : there is a mark about the middle of the נְ which gives it, at first sight, the appearance of a פְּ, but it is a flaw in the paper and not made with the pen. xl. 20 b, בְּבִרְיתָתָה : the הָ is there. xl. 13 c, בְּנָה : there is no sign of נָ, nor room for it between הָ and נָה : a בְּ or כְּ is possible after נָה. xl. 20 a, נָה. בְּ before לְ. xl. 23 b, שְׁלַשְׁׁהָ. xlvi. 6 b, נְגַעַן. xlvii. 11 a, גָּמָם : we originally supplied this obvious particle at the beginning, but abandoned it, as no traces of the letters remain. xlvii. 23 a, מְיוּשָׁהָ. xlvii. 23 b, בְּנָן : we see no traces of any but the last letter, which may be a נְ. xlviii. 11 b, אַשְׁ[רְ]אַשְׁ[וְ] : we find no signs of אַשְׁ[וְ]. xl. 7 b, לְהַשְׁיבָה : we cannot accept this, but allow that our reading וְלְהַעֲזֵן is doubtful : the remains of the letters are fairly clear,

¹ We mentally supplied [הַ]אַתְּ הַ[לְ]עַד ; see translation.

but their form is peculiar. xl ix. 10 d, וַיִּשְׁבֹּהוּ: we read וַיִּשְׁבֹּהוּ but their form is peculiar.

(c) In the following cases the reading is uncertain: xl. 10 margin, וַיִּבְשְׁכָנֵן, for the unmeaning נְבָשָׁנֵן, is possible. xl. 22, [עֲמִירָה]¹ [חַחַת]: of the letters supplied only dots at the top of the line remain, which may belong to ע rather than to ח. xl. 24 a, [וְתַחַת]² [אֶל], after חַחַת, is probable. xli. 1 a, יָבֵךְ for יָכֵךְ: the ב (ב) is not very well defined: the א, though doubtful, is not impossible. xli. 4 d, חַיִם perhaps belongs to the text; perhaps a ל (but not לְ) stood before it. xli. 5 a, margin, כֵּן for בֵּן. xli. 6 b, וְרַעַי is improbable: our וְרַעַי is doubtful: it is, however, possible that no letters are wanting before וְרַעַי. xli. 15 b, margin, perhaps מְטֻמֵּן, but the word is crossed through and very doubtful. xli. 21 a, מְחַשֵּׁב. xlii. 5 c, מְמַרְבֵּן¹ for מְמַרְבֵּן: the horizontal line of the ר is not visible, as the paper is cracked, but the down-stroke which remains might have formed part of a ר: of the first מ (מְמַרְבֵּן) nothing remains, there being a hole in the paper: the second מ is doubtful: the next letter is more like ב than ב: the ר is very probable: the next letter was originally a א which has been altered or crossed out, but ת is very doubtful: the א might be a נ: the ת is probable. xlii. 10 c, margin, חַצְ[תְּ]רָא: the ר is above the line, as Professor Smend points out: the letter before has a long tail, perhaps תַּעֲקֵר². xlii. 10 d, the last word may perhaps be תַּעֲקֵר]. xliii. 1 a, הַיְם may be only taken off from the next page. xliii. 23 a, עַשְׂקָר: more probably עַשְׂקָר. xliii. 32 a, פ for ה is very doubtful. xl v. 3 a, the MS. has חַחַת, but the ח may be a ח blotted: חַחַת is probable. xl v. 12 d, מְחַמְדָךְ עַזְזֵן וּמְ מְחַמְדָךְ עַזְזֵן וּמְ are possible, but uncertain. xl v. 13 a, [פָּנִים]¹ [חַחַת] is more probable than [חַחַת]¹ [פָּנִים]. xl v. 13 b, וְעַד עַוְלָם for וְעַד עַוְלָם: וְעַד עַוְלָם is only possible if the paper has been pressed together; the space is insufficient for עַוְלָם: the remnants look more like גִּילָם. xl v. 20 c, תְּרוּמוֹת² for הַרְוּמוֹת. xlvi. 15 a, דָרְשָׁנָה for דָרְשָׁנָה²: the remnant of the first letter is more like פְרֹשָׁנָה (פְרֹשָׁנָה). xlvii. 9 a, ח at the end. xlvii. 10 d, יְרַנְן for יְרַנְן: the lower half of the doubtful letter (whether נ or נ) is

¹ We should naturally be glad to be rid of the strange form: at the same time, however, the marginal מְסֻרָה is distinctly connected, by the usual circle, with the word which was so read by us.

² We doubt שַׁרְבָּן in the sense close the womb: we have שַׁרְבָּן מִלְחָמָה Gen. xvi. 2, hath shut me up from bearing, שַׁרְבָּן נְרָבָם Gen. xx. 18, hath shut up all the wombs, and, where the limitation is apparent from the immediate context, Isa. lxvi. 9 אָסֵב אֶל הַמְלִיר צְצִירָה; but do these cases justify the absolute use of שַׁרְבָּן be shut up, in the sense of have the womb closed? Would it, used alone, suggest more than be detained or imprisoned (Jer. xxxvi. 5, 2 Kings xvii. 4)? For שַׁרְבָּן, cf. the New-Hebrew use (Levy, s.v. no. 2).

lost. xlvii. 11 c, חק מלכֶת for חק מלכָת: the words are very close together, and the ח (or מ) is uncertain: we originally read 'חַק מִמְ', but eventually decided for 'חַק חַק' after much hesitation, although מלכָת in the absolute state occurs in xlvi. 13 e, and although מלכֶת would naturally be written in the MS. xlvii. 20 c we supplied לְהַבֵּיא, but find nothing of the word left: the same remark applies to xlvii. 23 f. שׁוֹאָל. xlviii. 11 a, after מה probably nothing followed. xlix. 9 a, נִשְׁיָא after אִיָּב: the paper is so much discoloured that we cannot be sure of any marks. xlix. 11 a, perhaps מה at the beginning, but very uncertain¹.

THE EDITORS OF THE HEBREW TEXT
OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF
ECCLUS. XLI. 19.

A WELL-KNOWN Rabbinical term for God is מקומָן=place. It has hitherto been difficult to fix the date when this remarkable usage originated. Frequent in the Mishna, it is quite unknown in Biblical Hebrew. The question which the present note raises is this: Was it employed by Ben Sira?

The question is suggested by the marginal text of xli. 19 a, which reads וְמִמְקּוֹם וְנִינְיד עַל זֶה; the line is dependent on בּוֹשׁ of v. 17 and can hardly be translated in any other way than "(Be ashamed) before God and a prince of pride." Our question, in the first instance, resolves itself into a consideration of the relative values of the two readings here offered by the newly discovered MS. It is recognized by the editors of the Hebrew MS. that the marginal notes give "the variants of another copy of Sirach, or more probably of two other copies" (p. xii). A glance at these very numerous variants suffices to show that in some cases they represent the better text; though a thorough comparative examination of all of these would be necessary in order to determine whether as a whole the best text is that which the MS. presents in full, or one or other of the texts which are represented in the marginal readings. It must suffice for present purposes to recognize that the marginal notes are genuine variants.

I hope to show that there are the strongest possible exegetical reasons against the reading of the Hebrew text in xli. 19 a; that these do not hold against the reading of the margin; and that

¹ In xlix. 10 b, when it was too late to introduce the correction, Prof. Driver pointed out that there is not room in the MS. for מִמְקּוֹם, and that מִמְקָם should be supplied; cf. the Syriac and xlviii. 13.

therefore, on exegetical grounds, the marginal reading must be considered superior to that of the text.

The line in question occurs in the short section (xli. 14-xlii. 5) headed "The discipline of Shame," and in particular in a sentence or sub-section extending from xli. 17-19 a, which, together with the four preceding verses, is omitted in the Syriac Version. These verses run thus in the *marginal* text:—

כָּנְשִׁיא וַיֵּרֶא עַל בָּחֵשׁ	לֹא בָּוֹשׁ כָּאָב וָאֶם עַל פָּחֹזׁ
מַעֲדָה וּמַעַם עַל פְּשֻׁעַ	מַאֲדוֹן וְגַבְרַת עַל שְׁקָרׁ
וְמִקְמָוֹן וְנִינְיָד עַל זָדָה	מִשְׁוֹטָף וַיְרֵא עַל מַעַל

The lines may be rendered thus—

- | | |
|---|--|
| Be ashamed before father and
mother, of wantonness, | before a prince and a governor,
of a lie. |
| Before master and mistress, of
deceit, | before the congregation and the
people, of transgression; |
| Before a companion ¹ and a
friend, of trespass, | before <i>makom</i> and a prince, of
pride. |

It will be observed that we have here six symmetrically constructed clauses: in each case we have two terms expressing persons in whose presence shame ought to be felt, followed by one term expressing a course of conduct of which to be ashamed. This symmetry is broken twice¹ by the Hebrew *text*, once with and once without the support of the LXX and the Old Latin. In 17 b, probably no one will dispute that the Hebrew *text* = **מְנִשְׁיא יֹשֵׁב אֶל בָּחֵשׁ** = Before a prince sitting (in judgement) of a lie has arisen from an earlier text still found in the Hebrew margin and underlying the Versions by ordinary transcriptional error, **וַיֵּרֶא** having become and **אֶל, לֹא, לְ**. In 19 a, the Hebrew text has (in the main)² the support of the Versions (LXX and Old Latin) in reading **וְמִקְמָוֹן תָּנוֹר עַל זָדָה** = And before the place where thou sojournest, of a stranger. But here, as in 17 b, I believe the text reading to have resulted in transcription from the marginal (*תָּנוֹר*) from **וְיָדָה**, and **וְגַנְגָּד** from **וְיָד**); but in this case the transcriptional corruption took place earlier—before instead of after 132 B.C., the date of the Greek translation. The text reading involves—(1) the extraordinary construction **בָּוֹשׁ מִקְמָוֹן** = to be ashamed before a place, (2) the breaking of the symmetry of the clauses, (3) a most improbable isolation in respect of construction for this single clause,

¹ In 18 c the first word is undecipherable in the text, but the **ל** of **וְרוּ**, which is fairly clear, indicates that a parallel term preceded.

² For the last word **זָדָה** the Versions appear to have had something different; LXX (A B) has **κλοπῆς** = theft, and so Old Latin: LXX in **πλακῆς**.

which would agree as little with those which follow as with those which precede ; for, as the preceding (five) clauses are identical in structure, so are several that follow, an action of which to be ashamed being in these introduced by תְּנַגֵּר. The sense, moreover, of the whole clause “ Be ashamed before the place where thou sojournest of a stranger ” is unnatural. These objections, as it appears to me, would have justified a condemnation of the text as corrupt, even had no variant existed.

Dismissing the Hebrew text then as erroneous, we are left with these alternatives—(1) the clause is a later insertion ; (2) although מקומָתֶנֶּגֶר is nearer the original than מקומָתֶנֶּגֶר, it is itself a corruption of the real text, in which some other personal term occupied the place of מקומָת ; (3) the Hebrew marginal reading is the original, and Ben Sira therefore used מקומָת as a term for God.

The first alternative has in its favour that it occurs in a section omitted by the Syriac. The significance of this can only be rightly estimated in the light of a thorough study of the relative value of the texts of the Hebrew and the Versions ; but it must be borne in mind that the Syriac Version of Ecclesiasticus is characterized by the absence of long sections. The second alternative does not carry us far : for the Greek translation was made in 132 B.C., and we should therefore have to refer the usage of מקומָת=God sufficiently far back to admit of וְנִגְיָד becoming corrupted in transcription into by the year 132.

The difficulty of the third alternative is unquestionably serious. We should certainly not have expected so early and isolated an instance of the usage of מקומָת for God. It would apparently be quite isolated ; for there is no other trace of the usage in the Hebrew fragment, nor any clear suggestion of it by the Versions in those parts of the book of which the Hebrew has not been recovered. The Greek *rōπos*, the regular equivalent of מקומָת, occurs eight times in chaps. i–xxxviii. 14, viz. in iv. 5; xii. 12; xiii. 22; xvi. 3, 14; xix. 17; xxvi. 18 (**N**, A); xxxviii. 12. In most of these cases it is perfectly manifest from the context that מקומָת was not used of God ; in iv. 5 and xvi. 14, such a usage may have occurred in the original and been misunderstood by the translators, but even in these cases the supposition is unnecessary and improbable.

The isolation of the instance in xli. 19, if the marginal reading be correct, must then be admitted. The next point to be considered is the earliest subsequent usage.

The term מִקְרָא, used of God, is already frequent in the Mishna, i.e. four centuries later than Ben Sira. If, however, we are willing

to rely on the accuracy of the Rabbinical oral tradition, not merely for the substance of the early sayings, but for minute points of phraseology in them, we can carry the usage much further back than the period at which the Mishna was completed. It occurs in a saying attributed to Simon ben Shetakh, who lived about 100-70 B.C., and which runs as follows: מה אעשה לך שתהה מתחטא לפני המקום וועשה לך רצונך בגין שהוא מתחטא על אביו וועשה לו רצונו וגנו' (Taanith 3, 8). This would carry the usage back to within about a century of Ben Sira.

If we are not prepared to base much on this tradition, then we have to bear in mind that there is but very little extant Hebrew literature of the period of four centuries between Ecclesiasticus and the completion of the Mishna, and what there is (Daniel, Esther, and some Psalms) belongs to the earliest part of it.

The indirect evidence next falls to be considered; and of this the most important is Philo's use of *τόπος*. In his discussion of Gen. xxviii. 11 (ἐπήντησεν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ), Philo says "God is himself called 'place' (*τόπος*), because whereas he embraces the universe (*τὰ ὅλα*), he is embraced by nothing at all, and because he is the refuge (*καταφυγήν*) of all, and forasmuch as he is himself the room which he occupies (*ἐπειδήπερ αὐτός ἐστι χώρα ἑαυτοῦ*), containing himself and resembling himself alone. . . . Now the deity being embraced by nothing is of necessity his own place." *De Somniis*, § 11, Mangey, I, 630). The full significance of this passage only appears when we compare it with the explanation of Genesis Rabbah¹—רבי הונא בשם רבוי אמר מפני מה מבני שם של הקב"ה וкорאין אותו מקום שהוא מקומו של עולם ואין עולמו מקומו מן מה דכתיב הנה מקום ATI הוי הקב"ה מקומו של עולם ואין עולמו מקומו אמר יצחק כתיב מעונה אלהי קדם אין אנו יודעים אם הקב"ה מעונו של עולמו ואם עולמו מעונו מן מה דכתיב יי" מעון אתה הוי הקב"ה מעונו של עולמו ואין עולמו מעונו. The points of contact between the Philonean and the Hebrew Midrashic explanation are too numerous to be accidental; both introduce the explanation in connexion with the same passage: "And he lighted on a place" (Gen. xxviii. 11), both give the same

¹ c. LXVIII. (ed. Berlin I. 125 b, top).—The first part of the above-quoted passage is referred by R. Isaac Solomon to Ben Sira; see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III, p. 706 and no. 64, in the list of quotations prefixed to Cowley and Neubauer's edition of the Hebrew text. Mr. Schechter very reasonably suggests that the reference by R. Isaac Solomon is merely apparent, ב' the marks of citation for בראשיה רביה having become corrupted into ס' ב', the abbreviation of ס. The error might have been facilitated if it was known that Ben Sira actually used מצומם in the sense of God.

reason, although the Hebrew interpretation is a little terser—"God is called place because he is the place of the world, but the world is not his place"; and both connect with the discussion the fact that God is also called **מעון**, *kataphusgή*, i.e. refuge (Ps. xc. 1), although the mode of connexion is different: in Philo, the fact that God is a *kataphusgή τῶν συμπάντων* is part of the reason for the term *tόpos*; in the Midrash, the statement about **מעון** is co-ordinate with that about **מקום**. We must, therefore, conclude either that the Hebrew *explanation* of "place" as a name of God is derived from Philo¹; or that the explanation contained in the Midrash Rabba, although attributed to a comparatively late Rabbi (circ. 275–300 A.D.), is of much more ancient Palestinian origin. In the latter case, the usage of **מקום** is certainly prior to Philo's tract *De Somniis*, and consequently very nearly, if not quite as early as the beginning of the Christian era. But even in the former case, the *usage*, though not the *explanation*, may have originated in Hebrew: and this at least seems more probable, for Philo appears to discuss *tόpos* as a borrowed term rather than as one of his own creating. On the whole, the balance of probability is in favour of referring the usage of **מקום** for God, at least as far back as the beginning of the Christian era, i.e. about two centuries after Ben Sira.

Two points indirectly affecting our question call for briefer notice.
 (1) Parallel in some degree to the usage of **מקום**, under consideration, is that of **שמים** = heavens for God. This also is frequent in the Mishna; in the Gospel of St. Matthew, too, the phrase "the kingdom of heaven" is the regular equivalent of "the kingdom of God," which is used in the Gospel of St. Luke. But unlike **מקום**, **שמים** as a term for God can be traced back to the Old Testament literature; it there occurs once and once only, viz. in Dan. iv. 23 מִזְרָחֵ תַּנְדֹּעַ דֵי שָׁלֵיטָן שָׁמְיָא = From the time that thou recognizest that the heavens govern (cf. v. 22 עַד דֵי חַנְדָּע דֵי שָׁלֵיט עַלְיאָ). The usage is as isolated in Daniel and in Biblical Hebrew as the usage of **מקום** in Ecclesiasticus would be. On the other hand we can trace it sooner and more clearly subsequently: it occurs several times in I Maccabees (certainly in iii. 50, cf. ver. 51; iv. 10, 24), which dates from about 100–70 B.C. (2) The Hebrew text confirms the accuracy of the Greek in a passage (xlivi. 27) which had been questioned on the ground of its supposed pantheistic character. That either this sentence (קץ הרבר הוא הכל) or the usage of **מקום** implies pantheism,

¹ We should possibly have a parallel for this in the Targumic use of **מִכְרָא** for God, which Schürer (*Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, II. 879, n. 15) thinks to be most probably derivative from the Philonic use of **λόγος**.

in any strict sense of that term, is highly questionable: but the thought of the sentence is certainly akin to that which appears to have given rise to the term.

To sum up; the reading of the Hebrew text is improbable; the strong exegetical objections to it outweigh the support of the LXX and the Old Latin. The reading of the Hebrew margin, on the other hand, yields an excellent sense, perfectly maintains the symmetry of the section to which it belongs, and by familiar transcriptional errors would pass into the form found in the Hebrew text. The only objection to it is the use of בָּקָר. That objection is certainly weighty: for the usage is quite isolated in Ecclesiasticus, and cannot be traced with absolute certainty till nearly four centuries later. On the other hand, Rabbinical oral tradition carries the usage back to within a century of Ben Sira; the parallel use of *rōtos* in Philo most probably implies the use of בָּקָר as early at least as the beginning of the Christian era, and in the general lack of extant Hebrew literature between Ecclesiasticus and the Mishna the failure to establish the usage directly cannot be pressed. Further, the somewhat parallel use of "heaven" for God is found quite isolated in Daniel, written within twenty years of Ben Sira, and lastly, there are traces in Ecclesiasticus of that kind of thought out of which the usage of בָּקָר would naturally grow.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.